

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 are currently pending in the application. In the Office Action dated August 7, 2008, claims 1-9, 11-24, 26-42 and 44-56 were rejected. By this response, claims 1, 19 and 39 have been amended, without acquiescence or prejudice to pursue the original claims in a related application. No new matter has been added.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

Claims 19 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly being directed to non statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 19 has been amended to show that the system includes a processor. Thus, the system of claim 19 is not “pure data” as alleged by the Office action.

Claim 39 has been amended to exclude mediums such as “carrier waves” by explicitly recite that the medium is a volatile or non-volatile computer-usable medium. Thus, Applicant respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1, 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010). Claims 2-4, 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) and Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1). Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1). Claims 19-24 and 26-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010), Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1) and Gavrila et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1). Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) in view of Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Gavrila et al.

(US 2002/0026592 A1). Claims 40-42 and 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1), Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) and Gavrilova et al. (US 2002/0026592 A1) as applied to claim 39 above, and further in view of Ferguson et al. (US 2002/0082818 A1). Claim 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (US 6,178,511 B1) and Moriconi et al. (US 6,158,010) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Franklin et al. (US 2001/0023440 A1).

Claims 1, similarly claims 19 and 39, has been amended to recite “determining a local policy having user privileges for the local database network node, wherein the local policy is determined by locally processing the user role that is at the central directory, wherein the act of locally processing is performed at the local database network node that is one of the one or more database network nodes that is associated with the central directory, wherein the local policy is different than another local policy determined at another local database network node that is on another one of the one or more database network node and the another local policy is based on the user role, wherein the act of determining the local policy for a local scope of access for the user is performed at the local database network node” (emphasis added).

Thus, the claimed invention includes decentralized definitions of user roles which an embodiment is described in detail at least on page 6, lines 15-21 of the originally filed specification.

Moriconi does not teach or suggest this feature. Moriconi discloses in column 5, lines 47-55: “The present invention includes a system and method for managing and enforcing complex security requirements in a distributed computer network, and comprises a policy manager located on a server for managing and distributing a policy to a client, and an application guard located on the client, the application guard acting to grant or deny access to various components of the client, as specified by the policy.”

Moriconi further discloses in column 12, lines 31-40: “Referring now to FIG. 9, a flowchart of one embodiment of menu option navigate tree 814 in management station 212 is shown. Navigate tree 814 provides a set of options for an administrator to add, delete, and/or modify features on server 112 or client 116. The features that an administrator may add, delete,

and/or modify include global users 910, global roles 912, directories 914, local roles 916, local users 918, applications 920, application guards 922, and declarations 924. At step 926, the system administrator may then exit from navigate tree 814.”

Moriconi is silent with respect to “wherein the act of determining the local policy for a local scope of access for the user is performed at the local database network node.” The local application guard of Moriconi does not locally define the scope of access for a user as claimed. Moriconi receives a local policy that is determined by a global server, which distributes the local policy to the client. As such, at least the features such as “wherein the act of determining the local policy for a local scope of access for the user is performed at the local database network node” of claims 1, 19 and 39 are not taught or suggested by Moriconi.

Cohen, Franklin, and Gavrila also do not disclose or suggest “wherein the act of determining the local policy for a local scope of access for the user is performed at the local database network node”, and therefore, fail to make up the deficiencies present in Moriconi. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests the above feature, they cannot be combined to form the resulting subject matter of claims 1, 19, and 39. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 1, 19, and 39, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over the cited references and their combination.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge Vista IP Law Group LLP Account No. 50-1105 for any fees required that are not covered, in whole or in part, and to credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account No. 50-1105.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 8, 2008

By: /Jasper Kwoh/  
Jasper Kwoh  
Registration No. 54,921

**Vista IP Law Group LLP**

1885 Lundy Avenue,  
Suite 108  
San Jose, CA 95131  
Telephone: (408) 321-8663